Form C-104 Rev. 02/2009

VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSAL MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

☐ Conceptual Proposal ⊠ Fi	nal Proposal		Date 3/07/11
Contract ID 101217 - 503	3	Job No. <u>J5S217</u>	9
County Miller/Camden	242	Original Bid Cost	8,337,512.67
Contractor Bloomsdale Excavating	ng Co., Inc.	By Bill Priesm	neyer
Designed By		Phone <u>573-364</u>	I-8149
VECP# //-3/ (to be comple	eted by C.O.)	VECP Or	PDVECP
A preliminary survey by Bloom higher than shown on MoDot puther ratio of rock to dirt average of \$ 374,255 and a time increased design profile grade and drainabid quantities, and thereby eliminates.	nsdale shows existing plans. This changes a unit price, resulting se of 20 work days. The age structure flowling innate increased cost	ng ground elevations the excavation and fig in a net cost increas Bloomsdale propose es in order to maintaits and contract time.	average approx. 2.2 ft. Il quantities and increases e for the Rte. 242 mainline es to raise the roadway
2. Estimate of reduction in construc	tion costs. $\frac{\$ 3}{}$	74,255	
 3. Prediction of any effects the prop maintenance and operations. MoDOT Design: Review and i Maintenance: None Operations: None 4. Anticipated date for submittal of Specifications. 	mplementation of re	vised profile and dra	inage structures.
	3/08/	11	
-	(dat		1
5. Deadline for issuing a change ord contract completion time or deliver		um cost reduction,	noting the effect of
4/1/11	None		·
(date)		(effect)	
6. Dates of any previous or concurre	ent submission of th	ie same proposal.	
	Conceptual VE		
	(date and/o	or dates)	

Additional Comments:

** Portion Below This Line To Be Filled Out by MoDOT ** Comments: In an effort to meet the original completion date on this project of 12/31/2011 I recommend approval of this

	In an effort to meet the origin Proposal provided certain con should be issued with estimate adjusted Box Culverts and Roa based on actual field measure time and near the quantities o	ditions are met. No addit ed quantities and the folio dway Drainage. A final V d quantities performed b riginally bid.	tional time should be granted towing items to be considered. E. change order would then by MoDOT. This proposal will	for this change. An in Excavation, Compactor issued near complet provide a way to com Bar, P.E.	itial change order ting Embankment, tion of the project	
L						_
been	venticed by district	via hard shots.	A cooperative of	fort between 1	higher than plan he shownedde i dishid sl p original quantities c Deork, properly owne) Will be based on 5 decrined us noted 2/24/11	
	Rejection Recommended		District Engineer	Ü	Date	.
Com	ments:			.3		
	Approval Recommended					
	Rejection Recommended		l Highway Administra FHWA Full Oversig		Date	
1						
sign wori		ved as 25% VE. 25% split will be work. Blooms	Determined that di used in lieu of unit dale will also be co	ue to error in p price adjustm mpensated fo	ent due to r their design	

Aribution: Resident Engineer, Project Manager, District Construction & Materials Engineer, State Construction & Materials Engineer, EHYA.

Value Engineering Administrator—MedOT, P. O. Box 278, Jefferson City, MO 65102

MoDOT - RTE. 242 - MILLER/CAMDEN CO. Mainline VECP Proposal Costs Bloomsdale Excavating Co., Inc.

A) Original Bid - Total Exc. - Rock to Overburden Ratio:

1) Overburden : 355,743 cy = 48% of total exc.

2) Rock:

392,494 cy = 52% of total exc.

Total Exc. Bid Quan: 748,237 cy 🗸

B) Original Bid - Total Exc. - Weighted Unit Price Calculation:

1) Overburden: 355,743 cy @ \$1.75/cy = \$ 622,550

2) Rock:

392,494 cy @ \$4.61/cy = \$ 1,809,397

3) Totals:

748,237 cy

\$ 2,431,947

Weighted Unit Bid Price: \$2,431.947 / 748,237 cy = \$ 3.25 / cy

C) Mainline VECP Proposal Costs (see following sheet for quantities): \$44,226

1) Overburden Excavation : Add

25,272 cy @ \$ 1.75 /cy

Rock Excavation:

Add

73,174 cy @ \$ 4.61 /cy

\$337,332

3) Embankment:

Decrease

-48,688 cy @ \$ 0.15 /cy

-\$7,303 _____

Net Increase in Mainline VECP Costs =

\$374,255

MoDOT - RTE. 242 - MILLER/CAMDEN CO. Mainline Quantity Comparison - Profile Grade Changes Bloomsdale Excavating Co., Inc.

Note: Quantities were calculated using average end areas of mainline sta. and plus sta. as shown on the original plans.

A) Mainline Plan Original Ground and Plan Original Profile Grade Line (PGL):

1) B.E. Overburden =

274,004 cy

2) B.E. Rock =

 (\cdot)

381,422 cy

3) Total Uncl. Exc. =

655,426 cy

4) Comp. Fill =

4) Comp. Fill =

345,690 cy

Diff. From "A" Items B) 5 Pt. Topo Original Ground and PGL raised 3.5': -8,385 cy 265,619 cy 1) B.E. Overburden = 1,914 cy 383,336 cy 2) B.E. Rock = -6,471 cy 648,955 cy 3) Total Uncl. Exc. = 12,500 cy 358,190 cy 4) Comp. Fill =

C) 5 Pt. Topo Original Ground and Plan Original PGL: (VECP Quantities) 25,272 cy 299,276 cy 1) B.E. Overburden = 73,174 cy 454,596 cy 2) B.E. Rock = 98,446 cy 753,872 cy 3) Total Uncl. Exc. = -48,688 cy 297,002 cy

MoDOT - RTE. 242 - MILLER/CAMDEN CO. <u>Earthwork Volume Summary Sheet</u> <u>Bloomsdale Excavating Co., Inc.</u>

Note: Mainline sta 255+00 to sta. 354+35.03 See page 14 for volume totals.

A) 5 Pt. Topo Original Ground and PGL Raised 3.5 ft.:

1) B.E. Overburden =	265,619	су
2) B.E. Rock =	383,336	-
3) Total Uncl. Exc. =	648,955	
4) Comp. Fill =	358,190	су



Jen. 18, 2011

Dear Mr. Kincald:

Bloomside Excavaling Do, Inc. proposes a VECP to review the project design profile grades end through exchange a completed Corceptual Foreyeak VECP for review design supporting data to exist our propose. The design profile grades would be raked as necessary in order to maintain the editional left quantities and the original trock-to-ver-briden ratio, thereby eliginating its storest and than increases. We necessary settled increases the design test time or another fact that or constraint is trayled completed or original review to the "before" restrictions, so any changes to design will have to the original properties are graphered to obtain a MODCIT exproved class to expect the consideration and expedited standards. We are propered to obtain a MODCIT exproved class or consideration and expedited standards. We are propered to obtain a MODCIT exproved class or consideration and expedited standards. We are propered to obtain a MODCIT exproved class or consideration and expedited standards are as trapered to obtain a MODCIT exproved.

Doe to the foot that the NIP has already been given, and that chenging of the profile grades will affect several limins of work such as, encoden control, chenting and grabbing, excepting, this, and chings served mas, it is impossible that we receive direction from MODOST by Jan. 25, 2011, in order not to impact the project exchedute.

. We are available at your earliest convenience to discuss this proposal in more detail.

Shoerely

Il Prisamovar P.I. 3. P.E.

": Enclosed; Conceptual VECP, Supporting calculations



April 12, 2011

Mr. Travis Koestner P.E. Assistant State Construction And Materials Engineer Missouri Department of Transportation Central Office-Construction/Materials 1617 Missouri Blvd Jefferson City, MO 65102

> RE: Miller/Camiden Co. Rte. 242 Project No. J5S2179

Dear Mr. Koestner:

Bloomsdale Excavating Company submits the following response to our meeting with you and Patri Lemongelli on Friday March 11, 2011 regarding the VECP on the Rtc. 242 project.

Bloomsdale Excavating Company followed the "Construction Inspection Guidance for Section 104" in strict accordance when preparing its Conceptual VECP submitted on January 18, 2011. Missouri Department of Transportation, District 5, promptly responded verbally by requesting a meeting with Bloomsdale Excavating Company for Friday, January 21, 2011. At this meeting, Roger Schwartz, District Engineer and Patti Lemongelli, District Construction and Materials Engineer, confirmed that the Conceptual VECP was approved "on up the line" and directed us to proceed with implementation. This approval process adhered to the 10-day turnsround as identified in the "Construction Inspection Guidance for Section 104".

Bloomsdale Excavating Company then proceeded to obtain additional field data needed along with fact design calculations to implement the approved Conceptual VECP. Bloomsdale's Engineers and MODOT District 5 Design Engineers openly exchanged data in a "partnering spirit", in an effort to expedite the re-design process so as not to delay project construction. Upon completion of obtaining field data, performing all necessary engineering calculations and cost analysis, Bloomsdale Excavating Company prepared the Einal VECP as detailed in the "Construction Inspection Guidance for Section 104". The Einal VECP was submitted to District 5 Resident Engineer, Josh Kincaid, on March 7, 2011 (again in accordance with the "Construction Inspection Guidance for Section 104").





On March 8, 2011, we received a call from Patti Lemongelli to Inform us that the WECP was not approved at the Central Office and she recommended that we meet to discuss further and scheduled a meeting for Friday March 11, 2011 to meet with you, Dave Ahlvers and Patti Lemongelli. As discussed in our meeting of March 11, 2011, Bloomsdale Excavating Company still firmly believes that this is a viable VECP in accordance with the "Construction Inspection Guidance for Section 104". From the time of our initial Conceptual VECP submission and approval, until the time of our March 11, 2011 meeting, there were no deviations that changed the viability of the VECP. If the Conceptual VECP was not viable, why were we informed it was approved and directed to proceed with implementation? If it was not viable, why did MoDOT incorporate the VECP design change into the project, taking advantage of 1) the idea that Bloomsdale Excavating Company developed, 2) the resulting large dollar savings, and 3) reduction in the time of completion of the project?

The VECP adjusted the design profile grades, which resulted in a decrease in the Unclassified Excavation quantities, which resulted in a time and cost savings to the State. The time and cost savings resulting from the profile grade design change is unrelated to and is not predicated on any existing ground contour errors. In our meeting of March 11, 2011, you proposed to reimburse Bleomsdale Excavating Co. for all its cost associated with the development and implementation of this design change. Additionally, you suggested that this proposed design change did not fit the standard VECP criteria, but that it more accurately aligned with a PDVECP. Under a PDVECP the cost savings splitwould be 25% to the Contractor and 75% to MoDOT, in lieu of the equal cost savings sharing of 50/50% in a VECP.

Although Bloomsdale Excavating does not agree with the reasons given by MoDOT for changing its VECP to a PDVECP, in a spirit of cooperation, and as an offer of settlement only, we will agree to your offer and the amounts as set forth below:

Bloomsdale Excavating Company's Cost to develop/implement the design change \$49,095.00

Sincerely,

William T. Priesmeyer P.L.S., P.E.

Business Development Director



		·	



March 07, 2011

Mr. Josh Kincaid, Resident Engineer Missouri Department of Transportation Camdenton Project Office 93 Morgan Street Camdenton, MO. 65020

> Re: Miller/Camden Co. Rte. 242 Job No. J5S2179

Dear Mr. Kincaid:

In accordance with Section 104.6.2, Bloomsdale Excavating Co., Inc. respectfully submits the following information as a follow-up to the initial information in our Conceptual VECP Proposal submitted on January 18, 2011. Following the approval by the Missouri Department of Transportation of the Conceptual VECP Proposal, it was agreed that at each 100 ft. mainline station, a 5-pt. original ground survey would be taken, and then used to determine quantity changes relating to the VECP. Bloomsdale Excavating Co. performed this survey and the information was sent by e-mail to Missouri Department of Transportation District 5 design personnel in Jefferson City.

Using this new 5-pt. original ground data and computer generated typical sections, Bloomsdale Excavating Co. determined that raising the mainline profile grade 3.5 ft. and using transitions to existing grades at each end would give revised earthwork quantities very close to original bid quantities. MoDOT agreed to the proposed adjustment, the 3.5 ft. profile grade adjustment was made, and revised cross-sections were produced in a timely manner. Drainage structures affected by the PGL change were reviewed and new drawings have been issued to reflect the drainage structure changes.

Using the revised design subgrade elevations from the cross-sections that were raised 3.5 ft., and the 5-pt. original ground survey for each station and plus station shown in the plan cross-sections, Bloomsdale Excavating Co. calculated the new adjusted mainline earthwork quantities. This resulted in the new overburden quantity being less than the original plan quantity by 8,385 cubic yards; the new rock quantity was in excess of the original plan quantity by 1,914 cubic yards; and the new compacted embankment quantity was in excess of the original plan quantity by 12,500 cubic yards. All quantity comparisons are very close and achieved the VECP quantity result that was desired. The profile grade data, the station-by-station end-areas and cross-sections, and the volume calculations are attached to this submittal.





Missouri Department of Transportation March 7, 2011 Page 2 of 2

Bloomsdale Excavating Co. then used the original plan design subgrade elevations and the 5-pt. original ground survey for each station and plus station shown in the plan cross-sections in order to more accurately determine the VECP earthwork quantities in lieu of the preliminary quantities from the 3-pt. original ground survey used in the Conceptual VECP submittal. The profile grade data, the station-by-station end-areas and cross-sections, and the volume calculations are attached to this submittal. The result of this more accurate method of calculation is that the over-all cost of the VECP savings increased from \$313,771 as estimated in the Conceptual VECP to \$374,255 as shown in this final VECP proposal. Approval of this VECP proposal will not require an extension of the project completion time.

If needed, we are available at your convenience to discuss this proposal in more detail.

Sincerely.

Bill Priesmeyer P.L.S., P.E. Business Development Director

Attachments

